IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ELIPE DHARMA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO : 9454 of 1999

Between:

1. K.Nagendra Rao S/o Gopaiah, 7-13, Gaddiannaram Village, Saroornagar Mandal, R.R.District.

2. S.Narsimha Reddy S/o Raji Reddy, 7-1/E, Gaddiannaram, Saroornagar Mandal, R.R.District

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1 Government of Andhra Pradesh. Rep. by Principal Secretary, Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2 District Collector, R.R.District, Khairatabad, Hyderabad.
3 Commissioner of Panchayat Raj & Rural Development, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.
4 Gaddiannaram Gram Panchayat, Rep. by Special Officer, Gaddiannaram Village, Saroornagar Mandal, R.R.District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ declaring that the action of first respondent contained in G.O.MS.NO. 189 M.A. & U.D. Dept., dt.20-4-1999 purporting to include 8 municipalities and 4th respondent Grampanchayat into the area of operation of Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad, is arbitrary and illegal and further declare that the action of 2nd respondent contained in proceedings No.E1/1255/98-99 dt.21-4-99 purporting to denotify 4th respondent Gram Panchayat, is arbitrary, illegal and direct the respondents to act in accordance with law and forbear from disturbing the existing local bodies in the form of 9 Municipalities and one Gram Panchayat adjoining the area of Hyderabad Municipal

Corporation and grant such other reliefs as it deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.V.VENKATARAMANA

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 4: GP FOR MUNCIPAL ADMN. & URBAN DEV.

The Court made the following :

O R D E R:

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the subject matter of the writ petition has become infructuous. Recording the submission, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

_____

E.DHARMA RAO J.,

Dt.20.07.2005

tjs

To

1. Principal Secretary, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.

2. District Collector, R.R.District, Khairatabad, Hyderabad.

3. Commissioner of Panchayat Raj & Rural Development, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

4. Special Officer, Gaddiannaram Gram Panchayat, Gaddiannaram Village, Saroornagar Mandal, R.R.District.

5. 2 C.Cs to the G.P. for Municipal Administration & Urban

Development, High Court of A.P., Hyderabad (OUT)

6 CD copies.